



STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS # 34501-13219
AMENDMENT # 3
FOR ELIGIBILITY AND BENEFITS MANAGEMENT
SYSTEM**

DATE: December 18, 2019

RFP # 34501-13219 IS AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

1. This RFP Schedule of Events updates and confirms scheduled RFP dates. Any event, time, or date containing revised or new text is highlighted.

| EVENT | TIME (central time zone) | DATE |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. RFP Issued | | October 1, 2019 |
| 2. Disability Accommodation Request Deadline | 2:00pm | October 7, 2019 |
| 3. Notice of Intent to Respond Deadline | 2:00pm | October 28, 2019 |
| 4. Non-Disclosure Agreement ("NDA") Request Deadline (see RFP section 1.1.4) | 2:00pm | October 28, 2019 |
| 5. Written "Questions & Comments" Deadline | 2:00pm | November 5, 2019 |
| 6. State Response to Written "Questions & Comments" | | December 18, 2019 |
| 7. Response Deadline | 2:00pm | January 15, 2020 |
| 8. State Completion of Technical Response Evaluations | | February 20, 2020 |
| 9. State Schedules Respondent Oral Presentation | | February 20, 2020 |
| 10. Respondent Oral Presentation | TBD | February 27 to March 4, 2020 |
| 11. State Opening & Scoring of Cost Proposals | 2:00pm | March 9, 2020 |
| 12. Cost Negotiations (Optional) | | March 12 to March 18, 2020 |
| 13. State Notice of Intent to Award Released <u>and</u> RFP Files Opened for Public Inspection | 2:00pm | March 24, 2020 |
| 14. End of Open File Period | | March 31, 2020 |
| 15. Federal Review of Contract | | April 14, 2020 to June 26, 2020 |

| | | |
|--|-----------|---------------|
| 16. State sends contract to Contractor for Signature | | July 6, 2020 |
| 17. Contractor Signature Deadline | 2:00 p.m. | July 22, 2020 |

2. State responses to questions and comments in the table below amend and clarify this RFP.

Any restatement of RFP text in the Question/Comment column shall NOT be construed as a change in the actual wording of the RFP document.

| Q # | RFP Section | Pg # | RFP Language | Comment/Clarification/Question | State Response |
|-----|--------------------|-----------|---|---|--|
| 1 | A.16.1 and E.8.a.3 | 29 and 74 | RFP section A.16.1 indicates that the system shall be hosted by the State within a State of Tennessee Data Center; Additionally, RFP section E.8.a.3 indicates that the Contractor is required to maintain a FedRAMP certification. | Please confirm the system will be hosted by the State. If so, please confirm that the FedRamp certification will also be maintained by the State and that performance SLAs for response time will not be applicable to the Contractor. | The state is 'cloud first' for hosting options but will entertain state data center hosted options as well. Maintenance of the new platform will be decided when the platform is successfully rolled out. Yes, the contractor will be responsible for system performance, excluding state network and/or data center considerations. |
| 2 | 1.1.2 | 1 | The proposed solution must have been fully operational in the twelve (12) months prior to MM/DD/YYYY and must have been implemented with a go live date within sixty (60) Months prior to MM/DD/YYYY. | Please provide the missing dates. | These dates will be determined at the sole discretion of the state, due to various mitigating factors these dates can change prior to the award and execution of the solicitation contract. |
| 3 | 1.1.3 | 3 | The Contractor shall complete the DDI work within a 24 month period. | If additional scope is proposed by a bidder as a part of a value-add feature, would TDHS consider extending the 24-month DDI period? | No. |
| 4 | 2.1 | 6 | RFP SCHEDULE OF EVENTS | We respectfully request the State add an additional round of Q&A. | The State declines to add the additional round. |
| 5 | 2.1 | 6 | Response Deadline, 2:00 p.m., January 2, 2020 | We respectfully request the State move the submission date to January 15, 2020 or later, to accommodate extended holiday schedules and potential severe weather delays in shipping, and to allow our references sufficient time to complete | The submission date has been changed to January 15, 2020 via Amendment 2 of this RFP. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|----|--|--|---|
| | | | | and send the sealed reference questionnaires back by mail. | |
| 6 | 3.1.1.2 | 7 | ... use a 12-point font for text... | The RFP requires Bidders to respond using 12-point font. May Bidders use a smaller, still readable font for each of the following: a) figures/graphics b) tables c) headers and footers | Yes, respondents may use smaller fonts as described in the question. |
| 7 | 3.2.2.2 | 8 | ...and one (1) copy in the form of a digital document in "Microsoft Excel" format ... | Is it acceptable to provide the electronic version of RFP Att. 6.3, Cost Proposal & Scoring Guide, and associated required documentation, in PDF format since it is a signed document/scan? | Respondents should submit a signed version as well as an excel version. |
| 8 | RFP Attachment 6.2, Section C | 34 | | The Item Ref. numbering skips from C.28 to C.31. Is this a typographical error or are there requirements missing (C.29 and C.30)? Please provide the missing requirements, if any. | This item has been corrected. See item # 6 below. |
| 9 | RFP Attachment 6.2, Section D | 36 | SECTION D: ORAL PRESENTATION | Does the State require a response to this be included in our proposal? If so, where should it be located within our response, and can it be excluded from the page limit? Do we need to include this form with the rest of Attachment 6.2? | The Oral Presentation is separate from the response to this solicitation. |
| 10 | RFP Attachment 6.2, Section E | 37 | SECTION E SYSTEM INFRASTRUCTURE IMPACT ("SII") | Where should the response to this section and the Attachment 6.2 Section E worksheet be located in our proposal? | Submit an Excel document as well as a PDF or printed version in your response. |
| 11 | RFP Attachment 6.2, Sections A.3 and A.6 | 21 | | Items A.3 and A.6 appear to be duplicated. Is there a requirement missing or is this a typographical error? Please provide the missing requirement, if any. | Item A.6 has been removed and the remaining Item has been renumbered accordingly. See item # 7 below. |
| 12 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.2 | 11 | The proposed Commercial Off- the-Shelf or transfer application must have been fully operational in the twelve (12) | Please provide missing dates. Should this match the instructions in Attachment | These dates will be determined at the sole discretion of the state, due to various mitigating factors these dates can |

| | | | | | |
|----|---|----|--|--|---|
| | | | months prior to MM/DD/YYYY and must have implemented with a go-live date within the sixty (60) months prior to MM/DD/YYYY. | 6.2, Item A.7, items b and c? | change prior to the award and execution of the solicitation contract. |
| 13 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.2.3 | 12 | The high-level System capabilities shall: m. Be mobile-friendly (i.e., a customer-facing website is easily accessible via mobile devices); | Is the vision the system will function from both a tablet and mobile phone? Is the vision that ALL functionality will be mobile enabled, regardless of whether it is functionality for a consumer, provider, a TNDHS worker, etc.? | No, only mobile appropriate functionality (EX; service application, FAQ, etc.) will be available on mobile devices. |
| 14 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.2.5.1.1.h - Training and Knowledge Transfer Plan | 38 | Training locations: the Contractor shall finalize the training locations in consultation with TMLD. | Is the Contractor expected to provide any hardware, software, other AV equipment to support training outside of the training environment that will likely be accessed with a Training URL? | No. |
| 15 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.2.7 Legacy Systems to be Replaced | 14 | Legacy Systems to be replaced-Functionality to be replaced and included in the system | Please confirm that the only functionality that will remain in the current Legacy system at the conclusion of the project are Medicaid eligibility functionality and appeals and hearings functionality for Child Care and Child Support. What is the future vision for replacing this functionality into the new ESM solution? | This RFP is to address SNAP and TANF functionality only. TDHS does not process Medicaid, and any legacy functions other than SNAP/TANF are out of scope for this RFP. |
| 16 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.2.8.2 Platform Integration | 14 | Platform Integration TDHS will share the EIP component product selection with the Contractor as the decisions are finalized | Is there an established standard for architecture, interfaces, data sharing, etc., defined by the State, that is driving the solution for all the contractors? | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|---|----|---|--|---|
| 17 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.20.B User Account Management | 34 | Provide assistance to TDHS, as required, in administering Single Sign-On user accounts when Single Sign-On is ready. | <p>Please identify the scope of users that would be supported by the vendor?</p> <p>Would there be users beyond those accessing the Eligibility and Benefits Management System?</p> <p>If yes, what is the volume of users that would require support?</p> | <p>(1) The scope of users will be the Family Assistance Division.</p> <p>(2) Not applicable to this solicitation.</p> |
| 18 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.21.3 | 35 | The Contractor shall roll-out a Pilot Implementation and collaborate with required federal entities and TDHS/STS throughout the process. | Does TDHS have a preferred pilot strategy that vendors should be aware of? Location? Size? Scope? i.e. is there any limited system functionality that TDHS is considering might be made available statewide during the pilot? | This has not yet been defined by the State. |
| 19 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.22 | 35 | The Statewide Implementation will be considered successfully completed according to the approval process described in Contract Section A.3.2. | Contract section A.3.2 does not appear to describe an approval process. Is this section cross-reference correct? Please clarify. | This item has been corrected. See item # 4 below. |
| 20 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.22 Statewide Implementation | 35 | If the State and federal entities provide approval in the form of a go-decision following the Pilot Implementation Gate Review, the Contractor shall implement the System at a Statewide level. | Does TDHS have a vision for a statewide (big-bang) rollout following the pilot or a phased statewide rollout? | This has not yet been defined by the State. |
| 21 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.22 Statewide Implementation | 36 | Please note that the retirement of Legacy Systems shall be handled by the State at a time selected by the State. | Are there projects underway now or being planned to modernize the remaining functionality in the legacy systems? | This is not applicable to this solicitation; no functionality will remain in our legacy system. |

| | | | | | |
|----|---|----|--|---|--|
| 22 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.23 Benefit Payment Accuracy | 36 | Prior to Statewide Implementation, the Contractor shall test a representative sample of benefit payments for SNAP and TANF in the new System against the benefit payments issued by the Legacy System. The representative sample shall be selected by TDHS, and within that sample, the benefits match rate (i.e. benefits to be paid by the new System as compared to benefits that would have been paid out of the Legacy System) must be the same in both recipient and amount. | Can TDHS attest to payment accuracy in the current system or are there any current system defects that need to be fixed or changes that need to be implemented in the legacy system to ensure payment accuracy? | The payment accuracy in the current system is adequate. The successful respondent will not be required to implement fixes to the current system to address payment accuracy. |
| 23 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.25 Training and Knowledge Transfer | 38 | The Contractor shall work with the TDHS Office of Talent Management, Learning and Development ("TMLD") in planning, developing, and implementing all end user training for up to two thousand (2,000) FA eligibility staff located in) offices across Tennessee. | Can TDHS identify the roles and resources from TMLD that will be available to support the project? | The State will make resources available to the extent the State determines necessary to support the project. |
| 24 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.25 Training and Knowledge Transfer | 38 | As of June 2018, the number of State technical staff to be included in knowledge transfer activities is forty-five (45). | Can TDHS provide roles and staff levels that are included in the 45 staff count? | No. |

| | | | | | |
|----|---|----|---|---|--|
| 25 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.25.10 Training and Knowledge Transfer Plan | 39 | The Contractor shall build and maintain at least one (1) fully functional training and knowledge transfer environment per concurrent release representative of the final-state operational System (e.g., final UI/graphical UI) that is dedicated to supporting training and knowledge transfer content development and delivery. Fully functioning assumes there are test environments to support all batch processes, interfaces, API calls, document storage, etc. | Will the Vendor have the ability to integrate the training environment with either a training or test version of every supporting subsystem and interface to simulate end to end processing? | Yes. |
| 26 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.25.13.4 End User Training | 40 | The Contractor shall update the user manual if its content is affected by System updates and changes throughout the life of the Contract. | Is there a specific frequency that the vendor should expect to update the user manual? After each release? Quarterly, other? Is this specific to documentation updates noted in A.32.2 M & O Performance Targets? | At this time the state does not have a specific frequency indicated for user manual updates. |
| 27 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.25.13.5 End User Training | 40 | TMLD's learning management tool, Enterprise Learning Management ("ELM"), is anticipated to be used to schedule and track all training sessions and staff attendance. | Does TDHS expect to use the State's ELM for storing End User Training documentation, Operations documentation, job aids, policy documentation, etc.? If not, is the Contractor expected to provide and maintain this environment? | The State will provide and maintain this environment. |
| 28 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.25.3 Training and Knowledge Transfer Plan | 38 | The Contractor shall develop a skills assessment tool to assess the training and knowledge transfer needs and skill levels of affected staff and other affected stakeholders. The skills assessment tool should be approved by the State. | Is the Contractor expected to develop and produce skills assessment reports for TDHS? | No. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|----|---|---|--|
| 29 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.25.5 Training and Knowledge Transfer Plan | 39 | All training and knowledge transfer materials must be provided by the Contractor in both electronic versions and hard copies for review and for instructor led training sessions (for end user training) in sufficient quantities as prescribed by the State. | Does TDHS envision every trained user will be provided a complete set of hard copy training materials, job aids, exercises, etc.? | No, we do not. |
| 30 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.25.6 Training and Knowledge Transfer Plan | 39 | The Contractor shall produce all help files including interactive online help files targeted at System end users. | Please confirm this refers to the Help Files that are part of the new system. | Yes. |
| 31 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.27.1.1 Stabilization vs. Steady State M & O | 42 | The Stabilization period shall consist of up to one (1) year immediately after Statewide Implementation. | <p>Please confirm that the Statewide implementation is a phased approach, and provide the cadence for the phases.</p> <p>At what time does the one year immediately following Statewide Implementation begin?</p> | This has not yet been defined by the State. Early in the term of the contract, the successful respondent will propose a date for Statewide Implementation in the context of the Project Schedule that the contractor will submit to the State as required by Section A.9.2 of the pro forma contract. The State will review and either approve or reject that document and the dates it contains. Consequently, it is not possible at present to define an exact date in response to this question |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|-----|---|---|--|
| 32 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.29.1.3 Key Personnel | 48 | The Contractor agrees to propose within thirty (30) calendar days, and appropriately staff within forty-five (45) calendar days, any changes made to Key Personnel. | Is the 45-day staffing requirement from the date of formal client approval of the new personnel? | Yes. |
| 33 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.29.1.6 Key Personnel | 48 | For at least eighty percent (80%) of the work week, Key Personnel shall be located at the Contractor's Nashville facility as defined in Contract Section A.31. These personnel shall attend any meetings Monday through Friday, 8:00a.m. to 4:30p.m. CT | Please confirm that key personnel could be remote one day a week and attend meetings via conference call if not physically at the Nashville facility. | Yes. |
| 34 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.3.4 Collaboration with State Parties and ESM Solution Contractors | 15 | Collaboration with State Parties and ESM Solution Contractors: | Is there an established standard for process and data integration with ESM Contractors and IV and V and SI Contractors, defined by the State, that is driving the solution for all the contractors? | TDHS will be working with the SI to develop the integration strategy, once they are on-site. There is no IV & V vendor for this project. |
| 35 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.30 | n/a | | Section A.30 appears to be skipped in the numbering. Was this a typographical error or is there a requirement missing? If so, please provide the missing requirement. | This item has been corrected. See item # 8 below. |
| 36 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.30.1 and A.30.2 | 52 | A.30.1 Non-Key Personnel.....A.30.2 Additional Staffing Requirements.... | Does the state require a response to the requirements in Attachment 6.6, items A.30.1 and A.30.2? If so, where should they be located in our proposal? | Unless stated in the RFP, a response is not necessary. |
| 37 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, | 57 | A.37. Control Memorandum Process | Does the state require a response to Att. 6.6, section A.37? If so, where should it be located in our proposal? | Unless stated in the RFP, a response is not necessary. |

| | | | | | |
|----|---|----|--|--|---|
| | Section A.37 | | | | |
| 38 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.5.2 Go/No-Go Decision Document | 17 | The test assessment, test results, and recommendation shall comprise a formal Go/No-Go Decision Document, which is sent to FNS with a formal request for concurrence to move forward | Will the vendor, the State, or both be conducting the assessments that are components of the go/no-go decision, specifically the Training Readiness Assessment and the Site Readiness Assessment? | Both the State and the vendor will be conducting the assessments. |
| 39 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.5.2.P | 19 | Post -Conversion Clean-up: | What is the vision for conducting data clean up before conversion? Will the State devote a team to data clean-up? | This has not yet been defined by the State. |
| 40 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.8.2 No-Cost Changes | 23 | If new federal laws are introduced which are accompanied with additional federal funds for State use, the State shall work with the Contractor to determine whether resulting System changes shall be handled as a Change Order. | Please confirm that if any change in applicable law or policy occurs after the RFP due date that has a financial impact to the Contractor, then the parties shall renegotiate in good faith the cost, schedule, scope, resource, and/or other significantly impacted item affected by said change? | Yes. |
| 41 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section C.4 | 60 | In the event that the quantities of State-standard Hardware/Software, as proposed by the Contractor and reflected in the Design Package, are insufficient to support the efficient operation of the Solution and it becomes necessary, during the term of this Contract, for the State to procure, at the State's expense, additional State-Standard Hardware/Software, the Contractor shall be responsible for the full cost, at the rates currently available to | Please confirm that if there are modifications to the solution performed by the state which cause inefficient operation of the solution, the contractor will not be charged? | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|---------|---|--|---|
| | | | the State, of any additional hardware/software and/or System usage fees (including additional monthly infrastructure charges) that must be purchased or assessed. | | |
| 42 | RFP Attachment 6.6, <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section D.19. | Page 66 | Not Applicable. | Will the State consider including a mutual exclusion of consequential, indirect, incidental, special and punitive damages clause in the Contract? | The State is not currently entertaining modification to the pro forma contract. |
| 43 | RFP Attachment 6.6, RFP # 34501-13219 <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section A.37.b.5. | Page 57 | “Notice of Intent to Withhold – (NIW) – notification to the Contractor that the State is withholding funds and specifying the performance or compliance failure underlying each intended withhold. The NIW shall identify the NPPW and NCPPW upon which it is based. The NIW shall specify the total amount withheld. The State may not issue a NIAW without first issuing a NPPW and a NCPPW.” | Will the State consider limiting any withholding of funds assessed against the Contractor for performance or compliance failures to a total cumulative ten percent (10%) of the total monthly invoice amount? Will the State consider limiting any withholding of funds assessed against the Contractor to one failure should a single event trigger multiple failures? | No. |
| 44 | RFP Attachment 6.6, RFP # 34501-13219 <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section C.7. | Page 62 | “ <u>Payment of Invoice.</u> A payment by the State shall not prejudice the State’s right to object to or question any payment, invoice, or other matter. A payment by the State shall not be construed as acceptance of goods delivered, any part of the services provided, or as approval of any amount invoiced.” | Will the State agree to pay all properly submitted invoices within net 30 days to the Contractor? | The State will comply with Tennessee law regarding the payment of proper and accurate invoices submitted in accordance with the contract. |

| | | | | | |
|----|---|---------|---|---|--|
| 45 | RFP Attachment 6.6, RFP # 34501-13219 <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section C.8. | Page 62 | <u>"Invoice Reductions.</u> The Contractor's invoice shall be subject to reduction for amounts included in any invoice or payment that is determined by the State, on the basis of audits conducted in accordance with the terms of this Contract, to not constitute proper compensation for goods delivered or services provided." | Will the State provide specific terms & conditions that may result in invoice reductions? | If respondents have questions about the interpretation of the pro forma contract and invoice reductions pursuant to it, respondents should seek the advice of counsel. |
| 46 | RFP Attachment 6.6, RFP # 34501-13219 <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section D.5. | Page 63 | <u>"Termination for Convenience.</u> The State may terminate this Contract for convenience without cause and for any reason. The State shall give the Contractor at least thirty (30) days written notice before the termination date. The Contractor shall be entitled to compensation for all conforming goods delivered and accepted by the State or for satisfactory, authorized services completed as of the termination date. In no event shall the State be liable to the Contractor for compensation for any goods neither requested nor accepted by the State or for any services neither requested by the State nor satisfactorily performed by the Contractor. In no event shall the State's exercise of its right to terminate this Contract for convenience relieve the Contractor | Will the State agree to compensate the Contractor for any unamortized costs and reasonable wind-down costs in the event that the state opts to terminate the contract for any reason other than Contractor default? | The State's Pro Forma Contract template states that if the State terminates due to non-appropriation of funds or for convenience, Contractor shall be entitled to compensation for all conforming goods requested and accepted by the State and for all satisfactory and authorized services completed as of the termination date. The State shall not pay any other fees. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | of any liability to the State for any damages or claims arising under this Contract.” | | |
| 47 | RFP Attachment 6.6, RFP # 34501-13219 <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, Section D.19. | Page 66 | “ <u>Limitation of Contractor’s Liability</u> . In accordance with Tenn. Code Ann. § 12-3-701, the Contractor’s liability for all claims arising under this Contract shall be limited to an amount equal to two (2) times the Maximum Liability amount detailed in Section C.1. and as may be amended,...” | Will the State consider limiting Contractor’s liability for direct damages to an amount equal to three times the annual payments paid by the State to the Contractor? | The State is not currently entertaining modification to the pro forma contract. |
| 48 | RFP Attachment H, Functional Requirements FR1.2 | General | The System will allow the at any time before submission | Please clarify this requirement. | This item has been corrected. See item # 9 below. |
| 49 | RFP Attachment H, Functional Requirements FR2.13 | Apply for Programs-use case 02 | The System will provide the Applicant with the ability to modify any previously saved information. | If the applicant needs to modify information after submitting an application, would that be considered a change request? | If applicant means a respondent to the RFP, then it might be depending on the size and impact of the change. |
| 50 | RFP Attachment H, Functional Requirements FR 2.55 | Apply for Programs-use case 02 | The System will allow the Applicant to categorize each of the uploaded documents. | Is this categorization based on a set of valid values? | The State cannot answer this question, because the State does not understand to what the question is referring. |
| 51 | RFP Attachment H, Functional Requirements- FR2.56 | Apply for Programs-use case 02 | The System will allow the Applicant to enter any optional, additional information describing the document. | Is this expected to be a free form text box where the text entered by the applicant will need to be populated into the system? | This will be determined based on the proposals presented to state. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|---------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 52 | RFP Attachment H, Functional Requirements-FR3.35 | Process Customer Change-case 10 | The System will expunge the funds if the Customer remains inactive after a time period determined by TDHS, specific to each program. | Please confirm that a customer's benefits will be inactive after a certain period of non-compliance. If so, will a transaction need to be created to notify an EBT vendor to deactivate an EBT card? | Yes, to both. |
| 53 | RFP Attachments 6.1 to 6.8 | | | Would the State provide the Attachments in Microsoft Word format so they may be filled in more easily? Specifically Attachment 6.4 Reference Questionnaire? | The state will not provide documents in Word form. Please use the fill function of a PDF editor or print a hard copy. |
| 54 | 3.3 – Response & Respondent Prohibitions, Subsection 3.3.2 | 9 | | The RFP states that “A response must not restrict the rights of the State or otherwise qualify either the offer to deliver goods or provide services as required by this RFP or the Cost Proposal. If a response restricts the rights of the State or otherwise qualifies either the offer to deliver goods or provide services as required by this RFP or the Cost Proposal, the State, at its sole discretion, may determine the response to be a non-responsive counteroffer and reject it.” Can the State provide clarification whether it will treat assumptions in this classification? | RFP terms and conditions may not be changed by respondents. |
| 55 | 3.3 – Response & Respondent Prohibitions, Subsection 3.3.3 | 9 | | How will the manufacturer's licensure agreement be passed on to the state? Will the state procure all software and hardware required to provide the end product? | The State intends to purchase all software and hardware required to provide the end product. Respondents will not pass on to the State any agreement, terms, or conditions from a manufacturer. |
| 56 | Attachment 6.2 - Section A; Item A.5 | 21 | | The State is precluding the System Integration contractor, IV&V contractor, and ESM Feasibility Study contractor from responding to the procurement. Since the TennCare Medicaid Enterprise System is also being modernized and has eligibility and benefits rules | They can bid, but TDHS does not want a transfer of the TennCare solution. |

| | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|----|--|---|---|
| | | | | and related components, will the SI on that project be precluded from bidding on this project? Especially if any components are being transferred or leveraged for ESM from that project. | |
| 57 | Attachment 6.2 – Section A, Item A.7 | 21 | | Bullet point f requires that at least one large scale design, development and implementation project for a system similar to the Eligibility and Benefits Management System be performed as the prime contractor. Would the state consider changing that to read, “Performed as a prime or subcontractor”? | No. |
| 58 | Attachment 6.2 – Section B, Item B.17 | 24 | | This requirement instructs the Respondent to “provide customer references from individuals who are <u>not</u> current or former State employees for projects similar to the goods or services sought under this RFP ...” Since projects similar to the goods and services sought under this RFP would most likely be provided to state customers, why wouldn’t the State want the current or former State employees to provide the reference for that project (i.e., the Project Manager)? | These are the guidelines for the RFP based on guidance from the Central Procurement Office. The State is not currently entertaining modifications to this term. |
| 59 | Attachment 6.2 – Section B, Item B.17 | 24 | | This requirement instructs the Respondent to provide references from “two (2) accounts Respondent currently services that are similar in size and three (3) completed projects.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Does the State want five (5) different projects? · Can Respondents, for example, provide a total of three (3) completed DDI projects and use two (2) of the three (3) as projects that are being currently serviced under M&O? · Please clarify the | The State requires five different projects. |

| | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|----|--|--|---|
| | | | | number of reference required? | |
| 60 | Attachment 6.2 – Section B, Item B.17 | 24 | | Can the Respondent use a reference from a subcontractor's similar project to meet the customer reference requirements? | No. |
| 61 | Attachment 6.2 – Section B, Item B.20 | 25 | | This section says that "The State is amenable to including some changes to the Pro Forma Contract. The State will take all reasonable suggested alternative or supplemental contract language changes by proposers inder advisement during the evaluation and post award processes ..." Will the Respondent be docked points if during the evaluation process the suggested change is deemed unacceptable? | This item has been corrected. See item # 3 below. |
| 62 | Attachment 6.2 – Section C, Item C.20 | 27 | | This section asks Respondent's to provide "narrative that illustrates the Respondent's relevant DDI experience with eligibility determination and benefits management systems similar to the System." Can subcontractor experience be counted in scoring along with the Respondent's experience? | No. |
| 63 | General | | | What is the budget for this project? | Please review Section 3 of the RFP, which requires respondents to bid cost. |

| | | | | | |
|----|----------------|-----|--|--|--|
| 64 | Attachment 6.7 | N/A | | <p>According to RFP Section 6.7.9.1 "The Respondent must describe any State-standard hardware and software, in addition to the hardware/software described in the Exception Requests to State Standards section above that is required to support the Eligibility and Benefits Management System during the life of the Contract." This section goes on to note "the Respondent is not required to list the core Eligibility and Benefits Management System application". Since some Core Eligibility and Benefits Management System applications also charge licensing and maintenance fees in the out years, does TDHS require clarity from vendors if their solutions include such fees by adding to the evaluation criteria and to the SII cost spreadsheet the licensing and maintenance costs of the proposed Eligibility and Benefits Management System so the State has complete visibility into all possible costs that the state may incur. Furthermore, some eligibility systems integrators, and COTS vendors charge an initial and ongoing proprietary license fees which should be included in the cost comparison so that all vendors are evaluated equally and the state can make an informed and educated decision on which vendor offers the best value. Will the State update its spreadsheet and request this information from each vendor in their proposals?</p> | No proprietary solutions will be accepted. |
|----|----------------|-----|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|----|----------------|--|--|--|---|
| 65 | General | | | Can TDHS confirm if the 300-page limit is explicitly for the content in response to “Section C - Technical Qualifications, Experience & Approach Items”? Or does the 300-page limit also include response content related to “Section A - Mandatory Requirement Items” and “Section B - General Qualifications & Experience Items.” | The 300-page limit is the limit stated by the RFP guidelines. |
| 66 | Attachment 6.7 | | | <p>According to RFP Section 6.7.9.1 “The Respondent must describe any State-standard hardware and software, in addition to the hardware/software described in the Exception Requests to State Standards section above that is required to support the Eligibility and Benefits Management System during the life of the Contract.” This section goes on to note “the Respondent is not required to list the core Eligibility and Benefits Management System application”.</p> <p>Since some Core Eligibility and Benefits Management System applications also charge licensing and maintenance fees in the out years, does TDHS require clarity from vendors if their solutions include such fees by adding to the evaluation criteria and to the SII cost spreadsheet the licensing and maintenance costs of the proposed Eligibility and Benefits Management System so the State has complete visibility into all possible costs that the state may incur.</p> <p>Furthermore, some eligibility systems integrators, and COTS vendors charge an initial and ongoing proprietary license fees</p> | Please see Section 3.1.2.2 of the RFP. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | <p>which should be included in the cost comparison so that all vendors are evaluated equally and the state can make an informed and educated decision on which vendor offers the best value. Will the State update its spreadsheet and request this information from each vendor in their proposals?</p> | |
| 67 | Attachment 6.2, Section A | | | <p>Can TDHS confirm if the 300-page limit is explicitly for the content in response to "Section C - Technical Qualifications, Experience & Approach Items"? Or does the 300-page limit also include response content related to "Section A - Mandatory Requirement Items" and "Section B - General Qualifications & Experience Items."</p> | <p>The 300-page limit is the limit stated by the RFP guidelines.</p> |
| 68 | Attachment 6.2, Section A; A.7 | | | <p>RFP Attachment 6.2, Section A, item A.7 requires "a written attestation that the Respondent has successfully completed at least one (1) large scale design, development, and implementation project for a system similar to the Eligibility and Benefits Management System described in this RFP." Given Tennessee's most recent SNAP caseload information (423,135 for August 2019), will Tennessee only consider other US state</p> | <p>The State will consider those similar to the Eligibility and Benefits Management System described by the RFP</p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | implementations of at least 375,000 cases (or 90% of Tennessee's size) to be of comparable size and complexity to qualify for the purposes of this RFP? | |
| 69 | Attachment 6.2, Section B; B.17 | | | Requirement B.17 requires vendors to provide customer references for "three (3) completed projects. Can TDHS please confirm that "completed" means implemented and in production across the full state caseload and all locations? | Yes. |
| 70 | Attachment 6.2, Section C; C.1 Attachment 6.6; A.2.2 | | | Section A.2.2 states "The Contractor shall provide either: (1) a comprehensive Commercial Off- the-Shelf integrated SNAP and TANF eligibility and benefits management applications that can be configured, modified, or enhanced to support the requirements of the Contract;" By definition, a Commercial Off-the-Shelf product is one that is available for ANYONE to purchase and is commercially available through software resellers. Can TDHS please clarify in this requirement that Commercial Off-the-Shelf means a product any agency or vendor can buy and not one that can only be purchased by government entities and is commercially available through resellers? | TDHS would need additional clarification from the contractor on the nature of the solution, if not a 'transfer' solution |
| 71 | Attachment 6.2, Section C; C.1 Attachment 6.6; A.2.2 | | | In Section A.2.2, can TDHS please change the requirement to either include the specific dates or state "this RFP issuance date" such as follows: "The proposed Commercial Off-the-Shelf or transfer application must have been fully operational in the | These dates will be determined at the sole discretion of the state, due to various mitigating factors these dates can change prior to the award and execution of the solicitation contract. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | twelve (12) months prior to this RFP issuance date and must have implemented with a go-live date within the sixty (60) months prior to this RFP issuance date." | |
| 72 | Attachment 6.2, Section C; C.28 Attachment 6.6; A.31 | | | How many work spaces (desks, chairs, etc.) for State staff should be accommodated at the Contractor's Facility at any given time? | Zero work spaces for State staff should be accommodated at the Contractor's facility at any given time. The State does not intend to seek any accommodation of State employees at the Contractor's facility. |
| 73 | Attachment 6.2, Section C; C.28 Attachment 6.6; A.31 | | | Can TDHS please confirm that State staff will have their own equipment (laptops, etc.)? | Yes. |
| 74 | Attachment I | | | The instructions worksheet in Attachment I-Technical Requirements state "Some of the requirements are applicable for the Enterprise Integration Platform (EIP), and not the System (e.g., requirements for MDM). These tabs do not include fit/gap analysis and have been included on this workbook for informational purposes." Below this statement, each worksheet is listed and those that do not apply to the System are marked with "(not applicable to the System)". Can TDHS please confirm that the Instructions worksheet is accurate and that vendors are not required to respond to, or provide a fit/gap analysis to, those worksheets? Some of the worksheets, T5.12 Privacy & Consent for example, do not include the language stating "These requirements pertain to an EIP component and therefore a fit/gap analysis | We can confirm that they are for reference only. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | | | for the requirements is not needed." | |
| 75 | Attachment 6.6; A.29.1.6 | | | Is the use of offshore resources permitted? | Possibly. This will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. |
| 76 | Attachment 6.2, Section C; C.17 Attachment 6.6; A.18 | | | Can TDHS please confirm that there is no intent to push unmasked production data including PII to lower environments for testing activities (including unit, integration, system and user acceptance testing)? | No. |
| 77 | Attachment 6.6 & 6.2; A.25, C.22 | | | Section A.25. identifies a need to train up 2,000 FA eligibility staff located in offices across Tennessee. Does TDHS utilize service centers or call centers to augment their eligibility staff? If so, how many additional staff (beyond the 2,000) does TDHS expect to have to train? | The RFP identifies a need to train up to 2,000 FA eligibility staff and this is what should be considered in the responses to the State's solicitation. |
| 78 | Attachment 6.6 & 6.2; A.25, C.22 | | | Section A.25. identifies a need to train up 2,000 FA eligibility staff located in offices across Tennessee. Given that this RFP includes the replacement of COTS and ARTS, can TDHS please confirm that the 2,000 staff estimate includes workers across all 3 systems? If not, how many additional staff (beyond the 2,000) does TDHS expect to have to train? Additionally, can TDHS confirm if they expect the staff supporting benefit overpayments and/or appeals to remain as specialty staff or is the expectation that all staff will be trained on all functions | The RFP identifies a need to train up to 2,000 FA eligibility staff and this is what should be considered in the responses to the State's solicitation. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | including eligibility, benefit overpayments and appeals? | |
| 79 | Attachment 6.6; A.25 | | | Section A.25.13 indicates that “the Contractor shall complete end user training for the pilot site(s).” Can TDHS confirm that the contractor is only expected to conduct end user training for the pilot worker population and all other end user training beyond the pilot worker population will be conducted by State staff? | No, training expectations will extend beyond the pilot team(s) |
| 80 | Attachment 6.2, Section C; C.22 Attachment 6.6; A.24 | | | Section A.24 indicates that TDHS is planning to move from a program-centric to person/family-centric approach. As such, can TDHS please confirm that for the purposes of OCM and training activities, the vendor is expected to provide an approach whereby workers will be expected to work on cases with both SNAP and TANF eligibility? | Yes. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|---|
| 81 | Attachment 6.6; A.21 | | | <p>Pilot Implementation – FNS requires a 3-month pilot implementation but the RFP does not mandate a 3-month pilot. Can TDHS please confirm that a minimum 3-month pilot is required?</p> | <p>Pilots must operate until a state of routine operation is reached with the full caseload in the pilot area. The design of this pilot shall provide an opportunity to test all components of the system as well as the data conversion process and system performance. The duration of the pilot must be for a sufficient period of time to thoroughly evaluate the system (usually a minimum duration of three months).” 7 C.F.R. § 277.18(g)(2)(ii). This answer is for informational purposes only and does not constitute legal advice. Nothing in this answer shall be construed so as to restrict any of the State’s rights under the contract, including the right to approve or set the project schedule.</p> |
| 82 | Appendix 4 Appendix 5 Attachment 6.6; A.16 | | | <p>Appendix 4 includes use cases on the types of interfaces that will be needed for the system; and Appendix 5 lists many interfaces that TDHS believes are needed but based on our experience neither Appendix contains the full list of interfaces required to have a fully functioning and compliant SNAP/TANF system. We believe the following interfaces are missing and seek clarification that they are required: DMS - Name and address file for DMS Voter registration information job PARIS - Process PARIS</p> | <p>To be defined. The interface list included in the RFP is 'for example' only.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | | | <p>Federal Match Response PARIS - Process PARIS Interstate Match Response TANF Federal Report - Generate TANF Active File TANF Federal Report - Generate TANF Closed File TANF Federal Report - Generate TANF Aggregate File TANF Federal Report - Generate TANF High Performance Bonus File SSA – BEERS - BEERS Inbound job Please confirm these interfaces are part of the requirements.</p> | |
| 83 | Attachment 6.6; A.16.2, A.16.2.2 | | | <p>Reports – The RFP references reports in these sections and suggests in Section A.2.8.1 that the requirements for reports will be “validated” during the requirements validation phase, meaning there is no all-inclusive list of the reports required as part of the RFP. Given our experience on projects of this nature, there are typically about 100 reports in total that the new system will need in order to meet State, Federal and other reporting requirements. Please specify the number and type of reports needed so that all vendors respond to the same scope of work.</p> | Unknown at this point. |
| 84 | Attachment 6.6; A.5 | | | <p>Notices – The RFP does not specify the number of notices needed. Given our experience on projects of this nature, there are typically about 25 notices that require variable data and text . Please specify the number of notices needed so that all vendors respond to the same scope of work.</p> | Unknown at this point. However, we do know that notices will be produced in multiple languages. |

| | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| 85 | Attachment J | | | Training and DR environments requested by the State are missing in Section C.34.5 and Attachment J – Technical Infrastructure Hardware Software List for SII (System Infrastructure Impact Assessment). Will this spreadsheet be updated to reflect these two environments? | Based on recommended hosting approach. |
| 86 | Attachment 6.2, Section E | | | Hardware for components like the batch scheduler, scanning tools, etc. can generally be shared across environments to minimize costs and increase efficiencies. However, as per the requirement below, sharing of hardware across environments is not permitted. Could TDHS please clarify the expectation for tools like the batch scheduler? Is it permissible to have the hardware for components like the batch scheduler shared across environments? | Based on solution recommended. |
| 87 | Attachment 6.3.1 | | | Can TDHS please confirm there is no need for the respondents to include any hardware or software costs associated with either Standard or non-Standard products with their responses? | Please review Section 3.1.2 of the RFP regarding the cost proposal. |

3. Delete RFP #34501-13219 Attachment 6.1. Section B, Item Reference B.20 in its entirety.

4. Delete RFP #34501-13219 Pro Forma Contract Section A.22. in its entirety and insert the following in its place.

A.22. Statewide Implementation

If the State and federal entities provide approval in the form of a Go Decision following the Pilot Implementation Gate Review, the Contractor shall implement the System at a Statewide level and shall:

- a. Assess the pre-implementation readiness of each part of TDHS and document the status in a pre-implementation readiness assessment.
- b. Deliver the Statewide Implementation Plan Deliverable to TDHS.

- c. Develop the Release Plan, which shall also include both pre-production and production releases. The Contractor shall address and fix all findings and work with TDHS to gain formal written acceptance before the Statewide Implementation.
- d. Manage the Statewide Implementation including providing support to all identified user groups (such as central office and field offices) and enabling security access as defined.
- e. Provide input into checkpoint meetings.
- f. Develop and deliver an operations manual which captures all procedures required to conduct all M&O services, and the processes and tools to be managed and operated by the Contractor. Plans for the following services must be included in this Deliverable:
 - System administration and operations;
 - Help desk and incident/problem management;
 - Root cause analysis;
 - System monitoring;
 - User account management;
 - Security administration;
 - Database administration;
 - Break-fix;
 - Change and release management;
 - Training (initial and ongoing) of M&O and State staff;
 - Configuration management;
 - Performance management;
 - Capacity planning and management;
 - Technology refresh and replenishment services;
 - Disaster recovery services;
 - Escalation procedures.

The State will determine when the Statewide Implementation is successfully completed in accordance with Contract Section A.3.2, Section A.7.3.b., and Section A.35. Please note that the retirement of Legacy Systems shall be handled by the State at a time selected by the State.

5. Delete RFP # 34501-13219 Pro Forma Contract Section A.35 in its entirety and insert the following in its place.

A.35. Inspection and Acceptance

The State shall have the right to inspect all goods or services provided by Contractor under this Contract. If, upon inspection, the State determines that the goods or services are Defective, the State shall notify Contractor, and Contractor shall re-deliver the goods or provide the services at no additional cost to the State.

Except with regard to Milestone deliverables, if after a period of ninety (90) days following delivery of goods or performance of services the State does not provide a notice of any Defects, the goods or services shall be deemed to have been accepted by the State.

6. Delete RFP # 34501-13219 Attachment 6.2. Section C, Item References C.31 to C.35 in its entirety and insert the following in its place.

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| <u>C.31 C.29</u> | Section A.32. – Performance Measures: Provide a narrative that illustrates the Respondent's understanding of the requirements documented in this section, including how the Respondent proposes to meet or exceed the performance targets. |
|-------------------------|---|

| | |
|------------------|---|
| C.32 C.30 | Section A.34. – Warranty: Provide a narrative that illustrates the Respondent's understanding of the requirements documented in this section. |
| C.33 C.31 | Section A.33, A.35, A.36. – Illicit Code and Inspection and Acceptance: Provide a narrative that illustrates the Respondent's understanding of the requirements documented in these sections. |
| C.34 C.32 | <p>RFP Attachment 6.7 – System Technical Infrastructure Assessment:</p> <p>Submit final versions of the following tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RFP Attachment 6.7, Section 6.7.8.2, Exception Requests to State Standards • RFP Attachment 6.7, Section 6.7.9.2, Additional Required State-Standard Hardware/Software <p>The above tables must include all final revised quantities of the hardware/software that the vendor is proposing to support the Eligibility and Benefits Management System. In addition, provide a narrative that illustrates how the Respondent will provide the services required by this Contract compliant with the technical environment described by the State Enterprise Technology Architecture Standard. See RFP Attachment 6.6 Pro Forma Contract Attachment D. In addition, describe in detail the technical architecture of the Eligibility and Benefits Management System. Included in this description shall be an overall architecture block diagram and a detailed description of each major architecture component and its role in the overall function of the system. Include and identify all third-party software. Also describe any use of technology in the proposed architecture which will be different than Respondent's other previous installations. Also, given the provisions of RFP ATTACHMENT 6.6 PRO FORMA CONTRACT, section A.1.3, provide a list of all components within the Eligibility and Benefits Management System for which you cannot provide computer source code.</p> |
| C.35 C.33 | Provide a narrative that describes how the System will have Response time averaging two (2) seconds or better, and never more than three (3) second response time, for all online activities, unless the State specifically agrees to waive this response time metric. Response time is defined as the amount of time between pressing the RETURN or ENTER key or depressing a mouse button and receiving a data- driven response on the screen, i.e., not just a message or indicator that a response is forthcoming. |

7. Delete RFP # 34501-13219 Attachment 6.2. Section A, Item Reference A.6 and A.7 in their entirety and insert the following in its place.

| | |
|------------|--|
| A.6 | <p>Provide an official document or letter from an accredited credit bureau, verified and dated within the last three (3) months and indicating a satisfactory credit score for the Respondent.</p> <p>(NOTE: A credit bureau report number without the full report is insufficient and will not be considered responsive.)</p> |
|------------|--|

| | |
|----------------|--|
| A.7 A.6 | <p>Provide a written attestation that the Respondent <u>has</u> successfully completed at least one (1) large scale design, development, and implementation project for a system similar to the Eligibility and Benefits Management System described in this RFP.</p> <p>The project must meet all the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Comparable in size and complexity to that specified herein, or larger; b) System's SNAP/TANF functionality has been fully operational in the twelve (12) months prior to the RFP Proposal due date; c) Have implemented with a "go live" date within the sixty (60) months prior to the RFP Proposal due date; d) Included SNAP and/or TANF eligibility determination; e) For a state or local government health/human services agency; f) Performed as the prime contractor. <p>Supporting documentation shall consist at a minimum of name of the entity, total contract value as set for the initial contract scope of work, number of enrollees, dates of the project, services provided by the Respondent, project status as of RFP proposal submission (e.g. complete), products implemented, the modules/functionality within those products that were deployed, and Key Personnel who are/were involved in the project.</p> |
|----------------|--|

8. Add the following as RFP # 34501-13219, Pro Forma Contract Section A.30

A.30. Personnel

9. Delete RFP # 34501-13219 Attachment H: Functional Requirements, Item Reference FR1.2 in its entirety and insert the following in its place.

| | |
|-------|---|
| FR1.2 | The System will allow the <u>Applicant to erase any /all pre-screening, eligibility</u> at any time before submission |
|-------|---|

10. RFP Amendment Effective Date. The revisions set forth herein shall be effective upon release. All other terms and conditions of this RFP not expressly amended herein shall remain in full force and effect.